R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 257 TE 000 260

ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH.
BY- CRISP, RAYMOND E., ED.
ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CTR., URBANA
PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.96 49P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, *TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, COMPOSITION (LITERARY), EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, GRAMMAR, LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, SOCIAL DIALECTS, STUDENT TEACHING, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, TEACHING METHODS, CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION, PROJECT ENGLISH, ISCPET,

TEXTS OF SELECTED ADDRESSES PRESENTED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET) AT THE 1967 CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION AND TWO PAPERS RELEVANT TO ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION OF ENGLISH TEACHERS ARE REPRINTED IN THIS COLLECTION. THE CONFERENCE ADDRESSES, WHICH EXPLORE FIVE ISSUES REGARDING THE CONTENT OF THE DISCIPLINE OF ENGLISH AND ITS EFFECT UPON TEACHER PREPARATION, ARE (1) "WHAT GRAMMAR(S)--AND WHY" BY JUSTUS R. PEARSON, (2) "WHAT LITERATURE--AND WHY" BY JOHN S. GERRIETTS, (3) "WHAT COMPOSITION--AND WHY" BY MARGARET M. HEVILLE, (4) "WHY MAKE THEM TALK ALIKE" BY A. L. DAVIS, AND (5) "WHAT FIFTH-YEAR PROGRAMS--AND WHY" BY JAMES F. MCCAMPBELL. PAUL H. JACOB'S DESCRIPTION OF ISCPET'S PURPOSES AND PROGRAMS PROVIDES A BACKGROUND FOR THE ADDRESSES, AND A PAPER BY J. N. HOOK, "THE STATE OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH" SUMMARIZES THE MAJOR ISSUES IN THE FIELD. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE (LIMITED SUPPLY, FREE) FROM ISCPET, 1210 WEST CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801. (RD)

ED 032257

ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

edited by

RAYMOND D. CRISP

TE 000 260

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Selected Addresses Delivered by

Institutional Representatives of the

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION

OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

at the

FIFTH CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
March 30-April 1, 1967

ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

RAYMOND D. CRISP
University of Illinois

Editor

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Issues in The Preparation of Teachers of English is sponsored by The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English with funds supplied in accordance with a prime contract between the University of Illinois and the United States Office of Education.

This report was edited with the assistance of the Headquarters Staff and the Executive Committee of ISCPET, and was printed by the University of Illinois Press from copy typed by Mrs. Ora Lee Torry.

ISCPET
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois
November, 1967

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Assoc. Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Assoc.: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 W. California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred G. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, University of Illinois; Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member
Roy S. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and William L. Gillis
DePaul University - Margaret Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - Sister Mary Constantine and John S. Gerrietts
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
St. Xavier College - Sister Mary Mark and George McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet Emig and James F. McCampbell
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Sherman Rush and Alfred Lindsey, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ix
Raymond D. Crisp

The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English. 1
Paul H. Jacobs

What Grammar(s)--and Why?. 13
Justus R. Pearson

What Literature--and Why?. 19
John S. Gerrietts

What Composition--and Why? 25
Margaret M. Neville

Why Make Them Talk Alike?. 29
A. L. Davis

What Fifth-Year Programs--and Why? 33
James F. McCampbell

The State of Teacher Preparation Programs in English 39
J. N. Hook

INTRODUCTION

One of the most widespread research studies in teacher preparation today is being coordinated by the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET). And, perhaps the one professional organization most directly concerned with English teacher preparation is the Conference on English Education (CEE). It is only logical, then, that the two should meet in active participation at the Fifth Conference on English Education at the University of Georgia. The panel Discussion on "Issues in the Preparation of Teachers of English" presented by ISCPET at an afternoon General Session of the CEE was, of course, not the first time the two had met, but it was the first time that some of the work being done by ISCPET at the cooperating universities and colleges was presented publicly to the profession. Further, much of the research being coordinated by ISCPET has not yet reached its final stages and could not have been brought to the attention of the profession before now. However, a few of ISCPET's Special Studies have been completed and their reports are now available.

To give a proper background to the papers presented at the CEE, one paper not presented at the Conference is included here. Paul H. Jacobs' paper, "The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English," which was presented at last year's Seattle meeting of the International Reading Association, will give clear indication why ISCPET was invited to assume, and was happy to accept, the responsibility of an afternoon session at the CEE.

An examination of the description of all ISCPET's current Special Studies reveals that one afternoon at the CEE was certainly not enough time to present and discuss all the issues in English teacher preparation with which ISCPET is concerned. However, three of the central issues in the English context are dealt with. Justus R. Pearson discusses language and grammar, John S. Gerrietts discusses literature, and Margaret M. Neville treats composition. Further, two other issues are treated. A. L. Davis discusses social dialects and James F. McCampbell discusses the fifth year.

One other paper is included in this volume which was not presented at the CEE. This paper, "The State of Teacher Preparation Programs in English" by J. N. Hook, was in fact written for an entirely different audience--school administrators attending an NCTE post-convention meeting in Hawaii. Although the paper is not directed toward the CEE audience, the paper is included here because of its overview of English teacher preparation, because it outlines much of the work that has been done toward our goals, and because of its indications of what work yet remains. Also pertinent here are Dr. Hook's summaries of the major issues in English teacher preparation: content and method--language, literature and composition; the educational cycle--methods and student teaching; and, the fifth year to accommodate an already filled and ever expanding preparatory curriculum.

One issue in teacher preparation which was instrumental in preventing much of the work outlined in Dr. Hook's paper no longer exists in the adamantine block that it once did. ISCPET is exemplary in what can be achieved by the cooperative efforts between departments of English and Education. Here, too, the growth of the CEE is witness to the needs and demands of the field of English teacher preparation being met by professionals from both departments. I do not believe that Sam Wiggins' "Battlefields" are too overrun by the opposing soldiers of the Colonel Conants and the Colonel Koerners. Rather, the camps have joined forces against genuine common enemies: the disaster areas of the classrooms in which English is taught and the war-torn zones of the university and college teacher preparation curriculums.

Departments of English and Education in many universities and colleges have found that they can effectively work together toward the common goal of preparing prospective secondary school teachers of English. Not always are the educational problems and goals of the curriculum understood or completely appreciated by the English departments; and, similarly, the problems and goals of the English content curriculum are not always completely understood and appreciated by those in Education. But the communication system is improving, peace talks have given way to discussions of operational problems, and not a shot has been fired around the conference table. Both departments are aware of the problems and the work that Dr. Hook has outlined; both departments have the same goal at hand: improvement in education. And both departments have a common meeting ground to discuss the problems and possible solutions: the Conference on English Education; and in Illinois both departments are finding a common meeting ground for active, applied research and study for the issues in English teacher preparation: ISCPET.

Raymond D. Crisp

Urbana, Illinois
October 23, 1967

THE ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Paul H. Jacobs
University of Illinois

The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers is the only Project English Curriculum Study Center devoting itself to the preparation of curricula for teachers of English. It is a five-year cooperative research project involving twenty colleges and universities,* all of which are in Illinois. "ISCPET," as it is called by those who are personally engaged in its activities, is jointly supported by a contract with the United States Office of Education and by local institutional funds. It officially got under way August 1, 1964.

Nature of the Institutions

The twenty ISCPET colleges and universities vary a great deal in terms of their size, the source of their support, their location, and the scope of their academic programs. They include over half of the Illinois institutions that prepare teachers of English, and together they graduate about six per cent of the nation's English teachers each year. Last year while one institution graduated approximately one hundred and sixty English teachers, another graduated only eight. Some are liberal arts colleges, either church-related or independent; some are universities, either privately supported or state-supported. About half are in or near Chicago; about half are located in towns or small cities scattered about the rest of the state. While some offer only four-year undergraduate programs, others also offer master's degree work, and still others also offer doctoral programs in English or Education or both.

Organizational Structure

In every sense of the word, the Illinois Center is a "cooperative" research endeavor. With its headquarters located at the University of Illinois in Urbana, ISCPET began under the general direction of Professor J. N. Hook, Director, and Professor William H. Evans, Associate Director, with the author serving as the full-time Research Associate. Last summer when Professor Evans accepted a position at another university, the author became the Associate Director, and Mr. Raymond D. Crisp was employed as the Research Associate.

---

*Presently Cooperating Institutions:

Aurora College	Knox College	Rockford College
Bradley University	Loyola University	Roosevelt University
DePaul University	Monmouth College	St. Xavier College
Greenville College	North Central College	Southern Illinois Univ.
Illinois Institute of Technology	Northwestern University	University of Chicago
Illinois State Univ. at Normal	Olivet Nazarene College	University of Illinois
Illinois Wesleyan University		Western Illinois Univ.

Contrary to what an outsider might think, the headquarters staff does not direct the work of ISCPET. Each of the twenty cooperating institutions has designated two professors, one each from the English and Education departments, as its official ISCPET representatives. It is these forty people, meeting together in extended session at least twice each year, who direct the countless activities of ISCPET. And surprising as this may be to some educators, they have proved that they can work in almost perfect harmony.

To provide for more frequent assistance and guidance than the forty representatives meeting only two or three times per year can possibly give, ISCPET has an executive committee composed of two permanent members (Professor Hook and the author) and three members who are elected by the forty representatives for staggered terms ranging from one to three years. Before ISCPET can subcontract with a cooperating institution wishing to conduct a special research study, this committee must approve the proposal for the study. In addition to this type of responsibility, the committee decides on major policies and handles any problems that might arise.

Assisting the two official representatives on each ISCPET campus is an ad hoc committee composed of from five to twelve members who, in most instances, come from the English and Education departments but who, on some campuses, come from other departments as well. Although they vary to some degree from campus to campus, the principal duties of the committee are as follows: to recommend curricular changes in the institution's program for preparing secondary English teachers and to help in implementing the changes and in evaluating the results; to assist the two official representatives in the planning and the conducting of special research studies; to consider the institution's policies for admitting students or prospective teachers of English and for retaining them in the program; and, if desirable, to recommend changes in screening and in policies for retention.

Lest ISCPET personnel become inclined to think of English teacher preparation only in relation to the situation in Illinois, and as a constant source for expert advice and assistance, ISCPET has an advisory committee made up of twelve nationally-recognized educators, including at least one expert in every area of the preparation of English teachers, from across the nation. The areas of specialization represented on the committee are linguistics, speech, literature, reading, junior high school English, senior high school English, national developments in the teaching of high school English, programs pertaining to all prospective teachers, programs pertaining to prospective teachers of English only, structure and articulation of courses, English teacher certification, and research design and evaluation.

ISCPET'S Raison d'Être

Although at least eight national events, which occurred in the six-year period just prior to 1964, were influential in stimulating the creation of ISCPET, here I will mention only two: the publishing in 1961 of The National Interest and the Teaching of English and the publishing in 1964 of The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English. These unpretentious little volumes, which were prepared by a special committee of the National Council of Teachers of English, unveiled to the public for the first time a

true picture of the sad state of affairs in English teaching and English teacher preparation across the nation. First, consider these findings reported in the first volume:

> Only a fourth of the nation's colleges require a course in the English language. Only 17.4 per cent of the colleges require a course in Modern English Grammar. Fewer than 200 institutions are graduating teachers of English informed about modern language study. Only 41 per cent of the colleges require prospective teachers of English to complete a course in advanced composition. Only 51.5 per cent of the colleges require prospective teachers to complete a course in methods of teaching English.[1]

> Only one-third (of the colleges) require work in world literature. Only one-fifth of the programs specify the need for a course in contemporary literature or in literary criticism or critical analysis. Few institutions provide for the study of the literature written for adolescents.[2]

And now consider these findings from the second volume, which, as you will recall, was published three years later.

> Today, only half (51.9 per cent) of the secondary teachers consider themselves well prepared to teach literature; slightly more than one-third (36.6 per cent), to teach composition; slightly more than half (53.5 per cent), to teach the English language. Fewer than one-third (32.7) feel well prepared to teach oral skills, and only one-tenth, to teach reading at the secondary level. Nevertheless, among the more experienced teachers, as many as 32.9 per cent reported not taking a college English course since certification or not taking one for ten years. In his more than nine years of experience, the average secondary teacher of English has completed only 0.4 semester hours in composition and 0.7 semester hours in language.[3]

And, finally, let us turn to another excerpt from the first National Interest volume.

> If the teaching of English is to be improved throughout the country, bold and immediate action must be undertaken on a national scale.

---

[1]Committee on National Interest. The National Interest and the Teaching of English. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961, p. 60.

[2]Ibid., p. 75.

[3]Committee on National Interest. The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964, pp. 5, 6.

This report on the status of English teaching indicates that assistance is urgently needed to achieve seven important goals:

1. To focus instruction in English upon the study of language, literature, and composition.
2. To educate teachers of English to the developmental and sequential nature of the study and to institute a national program for encouraging articulation of English studies throughout the school years.
3. To improve present preparatory programs for teachers of English.
4. To improve the preparation of practicing teachers of English.
5. To improve the services and supplies available to teachers of English.
6. To encourage significant research about the teaching of English.
7. To recruit and prepare more teachers of English.[4]

Although NCTE, as you will later see, is concerned to some extent with all of these seven goals, it is directing the greater part of its energies toward the first, second, third, and fourth, and especially the third.

Objectives

Of central and close relationship to the seven aims are NCTE's objectives. In brief, the problem faced by NCTE is this: How can a college or university, regardless of its inherent or acquired characteristics, modify its program for preparing secondary school English teachers to bring that program closer to an "ideal" phrased in terms of common elements in the curriculum and in terms of desirable competencies in prospective teachers? Our intent is going beyond the recommendations of The National Interest and the Teaching of English and other publications that present theory, in that we are searching constantly for application of valid theories.

We are making use of a study group of scholars and outstanding teachers to develop an "ideal" plan for teacher preparation, and are considering carefully recommendations such as the ones in the NCTE's The Education of Teachers of English for Schools and Colleges.[5] But we are taking two important next steps: (1) the implementation of a number of these recommendations through experimenting to discover how they may be put into effect in diverse institutions, and (2) the measurement of the changes that result from following such recommendations.

Because the present English programs of our cooperating institutions vary so greatly, it is impossible for us to state in detail the curricular

---

[4]The National Interest and the Teaching of English, op. cit., p. 3.

[5]Commission on the English Curriculum of the NCTE, The Education of Teachers of English for Schools and Colleges. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

revisions that are being effected in each institution. We do not anticipate that a single, uniform program will be the outcome. Rather, we expect to develop several improved programs, with an agreed-upon commonality of content and emphasis but also with divergencies made necessary by institutional restrictions or made desirable by peculiar institutional strengths.

Basically, we are searching for answers to such questions as these:

a. What competencies are necessary and what additional ones are desirable in a teacher of English? What varieties of preparation are effective in producing these competencies? What preparation common to these varieties constitutes the ideal core of English teacher preparation?
b. What is the nearest approach to the ideal that can be made in a four-year undergraduate program? What permissible changes in present requirements would be necessary in each participating institution in order to approach the ideal as nearly as possible? How and when can these changes be effected? What changes in certification requirements would be necessary and desirable for approaching the ideal? How can we lead the way toward improved certification requirements rather than remain subservient to existing ones?
c. What constitutes the strongest possible preparation for an English minor who may be required to teach English?
d. What constitutes the best program for a fifth year for (1) a person with an undergraduate major in English who has not taken courses requisite for a teaching certificate, (2) a person with an undergraduate major in English who already is certified to teach the subject, (3) a certified teacher who has only a minor in the subject, (4) a certified teacher with an English major but too poor an academic record for admission to graduate courses in English?
e. In what ways might a coordinated five-year program, or a two-plus-three arrangement, be preferable to a four-plus-one program? What differences might and should be involved? If Illinois (and other states now requiring only four years of preparation) moves eventually toward a five-year requirement for secondary teachers, what pattern of preparation will serve best?
f. What principles can be established for the most helpful supplementary preparation (refresher courses not leading to an advanced degree) for (1) the experienced secondary teacher who has been long absent from the college classroom and (2) the once-prepared teacher who has had no recent teaching experience?
g. What constitutes the best preparation for a doctorate in the teaching of English, intended to prepare persons for (1) working on the college level with students planning to teach secondary English or (2) serving as heads of secondary English departments or as supervisors of secondary English?
h. What are the best answers now determinable to a number of specific questions concerning the program for educating a teacher of English? Representative questions are:
    -What preparation in literature is of particular value to prospective English teachers?

-What study of the English language best equips a teacher for a secondary English classroom?
-What training in rhetoric and composition is especially needed?
-What audio-visual aids are particularly helpful in preparing an English teacher?
-What are the most relevant findings of educational psychology, especially about the learning process and about language learning?
-What sequence of courses in Education best equips a prospective teacher to cope with the problems he will face in the classroom from day to day?

But after setting tasks and objectives so ambitious as the foregoing, what has ISCPET actually accomplished in the first thirty-three months of its existence? I have already given you a partial answer to this question. Now let me try to complete it.

Accomplishments Thus Far

Throughout my remarks I have referred to the vast scope of ISCPET not only in terms of its tasks and objectives but also in terms of its personnel. You will recall that it involves from eight to twelve persons on each of twenty different campuses, thus giving it a total, roughly speaking, of 160-240 personnel. Yet, all of these people are working together with success and harmony. If we considered nothing but the differences in academic backgrounds of this number of people, I believe that all of us would agree that ISCPET's accomplishment in this area alone is worthy of study and consideration. ISCPET's organizational structure, its first major accomplishment, could well serve as a model for other groups of institutions and agencies desiring to join hands to research mutual interests and problems.

During the fall of 1964, ISCPET representatives met in Chicago for several days and, with the guidance and assistance of the advisory committee, of English teachers, department heads, and consultants, of administrators, and of Illinois authorities on certification, agreed upon a list of competencies that any English teacher should possess. Although at times we seriously wondered whether we would ever get a consensus on certain of the competencies, we eventually did, and we called the list "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement."[6] This four-page publication, our second major accomplishment, should not be considered "final" in any sense of the word. Revisions, perhaps even major ones, will be made to it in early 1969. In the meantime, thousands of free copies of the Statement are being mailed to educators around the country, with the request that they send us their reactions to it.

Curricular revisions constitute the third major ISCPET accomplishment. Without exception, every institution has made some changes (most have made many) in both the academic and professional components of its program for

---

[6]J. N. Hook, "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," College English, 27 (November, 1965) pp. 166-169.

training prospective English teachers. Let me cite a few examples. For its students who wish to major in literature, one institution has designed a special minor in rhetoric. This same institution is also revamping its program for candidates for the degree of Master of Arts in the Teaching of English. Another institution has recently added a special course in the methods of teaching composition only. For the majority of its students, still another institution is abandoning freshman composition as a course; moreover, this same institution is completely overhauling the remainder of its program for training English teachers. A fourth institution recently reported seventeen major program changes, most of which deal with its offerings in literature, which will go into effect next fall. Almost all of our institutions now require courses in advanced composition, modern English grammar, and history of the English language. Although these are no more than representative examples, they do show the type and extent of curricular revisions now being made or implemented at ISCPET institutions.

ISCPET's fourth major accomplishment is in the area of evaluation and measurement. From the very beginning of our planning, we were aware that we would have to have a test for use in all of our participating institutions, beginning before any substantial changes in our then existing programs could be effected and repeated annually thereafter throughout the life of ISCPET. Consequently, at an early meeting of the institutional representatives, we considered the need and selected the new edition of the English Language and Literature Test of the NTE Battery, which is administered to all prospective English teachers during their senior year. The purpose in using this test the first year was to establish a norm or base line for each institution with which the scores of graduates in subsequent years of ISCPET can be compared in order to see what changes occur. Presumably, these changes will be largely attributable to curricular revision, and perhaps to policy changes, since the type and calibre of students within an institution are not changing markedly during the ISCPET years. Annual repetition of the test should reveal any statistically observable differences between pre-ISCPET and intra-ISCPET graduating seniors. No comparison of institutions is being made; each institution is competing only against itself. However, a cumulation of test scores is being maintained at ISCPET headquarters, and state-wide norms are being established. Thus, each institution is able to determine the position of its graduates on the scale.

Another type of measurement and evaluation device now being used by all our institutions is a set of six rating scales consisting of criteria based directly on the competencies listed in the ISCPET Qualifications Statement and, for the most part, on the ones in the "good" column. ISCPET's Illinois Teacher Rating Scales are designed for use as follows: Form A, by the student teacher, to evaluate himself at the end of student teaching; Form B, by the "cooperating" teacher, to evaluate the student teacher at the end of student teaching; Form C, by the college or university supervisor, to evaluate the student teacher at the end of student teaching; Form D, by the graduate, to evaluate himself at the end of his first year of teaching; Form E, by a school administrator, to evaluate the graduate at the end of the first year of teaching; and Form F, by the chairman of the English department, to evaluate the graduate at the end of the first year of teaching. Thus, by the time he reaches the close of his first year as a full-time teacher of secondary

English, each ISCPET graduate will have been evaluated six times--twice by himself, thrice by supervisory personnel, and once by an administrator--on essentially the same criteria. Data coming from this series of evaluations on each of our graduates should yield some extremely telling and valuable conclusions pertaining to curricular changes at our institutions.

Earlier, I referred to the special research studies for which the ISCPET headquarters office subcontracts with its cooperating institutions. Together these studies are considered ISCPET's fifth major accomplishment. From them will come our chief contributions to research. Descriptions of ISCPET's Special Research Studies appear at the end of this paper. So far, there are thirty- four studies under way at one stage or another. While some are short-term studies and are at or near the point of completion, others are long-term and will not be completed until very near the termination date of our contract. A few of the studies have recently been completed.

Variety seems to be the predominant characteristic of ISCPET's special studies. Some of the studies are relatively simple, involving no more than a questionnaire or a status survey, together with tabulation and analysis of the data and interpretation of the findings. At the same time, however, others of the studies are quite sophisticated, and require comparative or other measurements to assure validity.

There is a great deal of variety to be found even in the studies utilizing surveys. Some of these studies are collecting data from selected ISCPET institutions; others are collecting data from all of our institutions; still others are soliciting data from hundreds of colleges and universities in every region of the country. While the survey is the major step of some special studies, it is only the initial step of several studies, with the subsequent steps being determined by the findings drawn from the data collected in the first step.

In case I have overemphasized the survey method of research, let me assure you that by no means do all ISCPET studies involve this approach. At the same time, however, I should emphasize that all of our researchers must of necessity begin with close study and examination of all published research findings pertinent to the problems they have identified to research.

In addition to their standard final reports, many of the directors of our studies are preparing instructional materials that may be used by any interested college or university. The form of these materials, also, is characterized by variety. For example, some materials will be filmed, and some taped; most, however, will be prepared as syllabi for courses.

ISCPET's twenty institutions provide an ideal testing ground for programs in teacher education, for they represent a true cross-section of the nation's colleges and universities, and their graduates are employed in all of the fifty states. Whatever can be made to work in these institutions will almost assuredly work elsewhere. Therefore, for this reason and with the approval of the U. S. Office of Education, ISCPET is submitting to the Office the final reports on its individual special studies at the very time they are completed rather than holding them until the over-all ISCPET final report has been prepared. By doing this, we hope to make available all useful data,

at the earliest feasible time, to all interested colleges, universities, and organizations, and individuals throughout the nation, so that they may employ, as they see fit, those findings and recommendations pertinent to their needs. Thus the results of ISCPET's endeavors will be given immediate national applicability.

ISCPET's Special Research Studies

AURORA COLLEGE. A study of a special two-semester internship program involving prospective secondary English teachers as assistants in the teaching of college freshman English classes.

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY. a) Cooperative study of literature programs being coordinated by North Central College.

b) A study to determine the validity of a minimal composition program for students entering a career of English teaching, if the students study composition at the optimum time.

c) A study to determine which of three or which combination of three courses in the methodology of teaching English is most effective.

d) A fact-finding survey of the present status of the teaching of English in grades 10, 11, and 12 of Illinois schools.

DE PAUL UNIVERSITY. A study involving development, teaching, and evaluation of the results of a course in advanced English composition, designed especially for prospective teachers of secondary English.

GREENVILLE COLLEGE. A nation-wide study of the supervision of student teaching in English.

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY. a) A study to prepare materials (syllabus, bibliography, and illustrative tape recordings) for a course in social problems in the English language.

b) A study to survey existing sources of recorded specimens of English dialects throughout the world and to create an integrated collection of 25 samples of speech representing the major dialect areas of the United States and Canada, with supplemental recordings from other English-speaking areas.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY. A fact-finding survey of the teaching of English in grades seven, eight, and nine of Illinois schools.

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY. a) Cooperative study of literature programs being coordinated by North Central College.

b) A study involving examination and evaluation of traditional and contemporary English grammars, being taught in selected colleges and universities across the country, and establishment and evaluation of a course in grammar(s) suitable for prospective teachers of secondary English.

KNOX COLLEGE. a) The preparation of video tapes and kinescopes and the use of them in the training of prospective secondary English teachers.

b) A study involving a transformational grammar in-service seminar, the development of general guidelines for teaching a unit in transformational grammar in the high school, and the development of video tapes to be used as teaching aids for prospective and in-service teachers of English.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY. a) Cooperative study of literature programs being coordinated by North Central College.

b) A study involving development, teaching, and evaluation of a secondary English methods course, with the major emphasis being on the development of critical thinking skills on the part of prospective English teachers.

c) A study of the effects of a speech unit and a unit in the art of questioning, designed especially for prospective secondary English teachers in a student teaching course, upon their performance in secondary English instruction.

d) A study of the effects upon experienced English teachers, without previous training in student teaching, of a five-hour course entitled "Student Teaching" and involving emphasis upon critical thinking in teaching.

e) A study of the value of courses in the Classics ("The Classical Epic" and "The Classic Theatre"), offered as electives, in the curriculum of prospective high school teachers of English.

MONMOUTH COLLEGE. a) Cooperative study of literature programs being coordinated by North Central College.

b) A study to determine the desirability of instruction in oral interpretation of literature in the preparation of prospective secondary school teachers of English.

c) A study to develop a course in oral interpretation designed to meet the professional needs of prospective secondary school teachers of English.

NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE. a) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the reorganization of its teacher-training curriculum in 1957-58.

b) Coordination of a cooperative study to evaluate the relative effectiveness of five different approaches to the teaching of literature in college, with the approaches being: by genre, by groups of literary types, by core plus some basic categories, by intensive textual study with a highly structured historical framework, and by the diversified period.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY. A study of the effectiveness of a filmed training program in composition for teachers in service as an agent of change in the secondary school.

OLIVET NAZARENE COLLEGE. A comprehensive study of the personal and academic qualifications essential to the successful teaching of the slow learner in high school English, and the structuring or modifying of the curriculum for the preparation of teachers, embodying elements of training found desirable.

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY. Modification of the programs of pprospective secondary English teachers to include historical and structural liinguistics, and a study of the effects of such a modification.

ST. XAVIER COLLEGE. Development of a classroom observattion schedule to be used in the evaluation of the English teacher's effectivveness in teaching reading skills appropriate to the secondary school levell.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY. a) Development of an opinnionnaire concerned with particular areas of language and an analysis of thee returns from administering the opinionnaire to prospective English teacherrs and teachers in service.

b) Development, administration, and analysis of an examination based on the ISCPET "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement." (This study is co-sponsored by thee University of Illinois.)

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. An evaluative study of Master off Arts in the Teaching of English (MATE) programs in Illinois.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. a) (See the second study listeed for Southern Illinois University.)

b) A study to determine the level of competence in educational measurement and evaluation possessed by Illinois secondary English teachers now in service and to ascertain the level of competence desirable in prospective English teachers.

c) A study to describe knowledge of concepts from literary criticism, its types and methods of approach to literature, possesssed by prospective secondary school teachers of English who are presently enrolled in courses in methods of teaching secondary school English at ISCPET institutions.

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY. A study involving developpment, teaching, and evaluation of the results of a course for teachers in sservice devoted to the practical application of linguistics, of principles of composition, and of various approaches to the teaching of the slow learner..

WHAT GRAMMAR(S)--AND WHY?

Justus R. Pearson
Illinois Wesleyan University

Not too many months ago I would have expected the suggested title of this brief talk, "What Grammar(s)--and Why?" to be most pertinent to any discussion of the preparation of teachers of English. We are all perfectly well aware that there are competing grammatical systems in the wind, perhaps as many as seven now, including the familiar traditional, structural, and transformational-generative, and that prospective teachers of English must know their way about in the field of grammar. Very naturally, then, the apparent challenge was to assess the competing grammars, to determine which one or ones best serve our needs as teachers, and to close the case with confidence--or at least hope--that the years of the adjacent future would prove our decisions well taken. I say, I could (perhaps) have done a neater package a year or so ago. The assignment would have been relatively clear-cut, though not quite easy.

But at present I am surprised by the sense that a more honest approach to my subject would be, not "What Grammar(s)--and Why?" but "Why Grammar--or What?" The shift is not intended for an attention-getter or an idle quip, and I believe it is not an effort to sidestep an important problem. No, the question, "Why Grammar?" rises from the very turmoil created by the competing systems of grammar. Call my reaction the counsel of despair, if you like. It is that. But certainly we can afford to look for a few minutes at a world devoid, not of grammar, of course, for that is an impossibility, but devoid of the teaching of grammar in schools. I will hope to make myself more understandable and less radical as I go along.

Since at least the attitude of these remarks is my own, allow me to introduce a bit of perspective so that you will be able to make an interpretation more readily. A dozen years ago I came to the State of Georgia to teach. I had a spanking-new doctor's degree and absolutely no training in linguistics outside the most conventional of graduate courses in Anglo-Saxon and the history of the language. In my first term I was invited (or dragooned) into participating in a SAMLA panel in Atlanta, the subject focusing on grammar. I was so green that I did not know that the quaint pattern of titles for the panel talks, such as "I'll Take My Stand--On Structural Grammar," had a strong flavor of the South about it. Among the panelists were Mr. Harry Warfel of Florida and Mr. James McMillan of Alabama, both professionals in the field. I elected to defend (or 'take my stand on') traditional, schoolbook grammar--the only kind I had ever heard of--and you can easily imagine the fate I suffered! I recovered in due time, however, consoled by loyal Georgia colleagues, and in the intervening years have made some concerted effort to inform myself at least partially in matters pertaining to language. Nevertheless, I am by no means a professional, and bring to a discussion of grammar only the great interest which any teacher of English language and literature comes unavoidably to have. A fair portion of my present academic work brings me before prospective high school teachers as a generalist rather than as a specialist (in linguistics, for example), and I am vitally interested in what is being discovered and taught about the role of grammar in English education. I hope

this week's return to Georgia after the lapse of eight years will show me to be, in respect to language, not unwitting though perhaps still misguided.

I have suggested we might try looking at a world devoid of the teaching of grammar at the secondary level. How does one ever get himself in such a black mood as to even consider that grammar should not be taught? To be sure, some of us college teachers have long entertained the thought that high school English teachers must indulge their love of literature and let instruction in grammar go by the board. If this ever does happen, may it not be that the teacher's instinct is serving him better than those traditions of the profession, or habits of the curriculum, which dictate that grammar must be taught? Why should we not bring the question out into the open and examine it? Therefore, I pose the question, "Why Grammar?"

Let me add a few more questions which have probably occurred to every one of us. I will put the hardest one first: If we really believe, as we say, that a normal child is in possession of the grammar of his native language by the time he is ready for school, at age five or six, why does he have to go on "studying" that grammar year after year, through rain and sleet and fog and hail? Is his basic understanding of anything enhanced by the study of grammar he undertakes in the secondary school? Put in another fashion, we can ask whether the study of grammar does any good. Does such study make any significant contribution to the speaking or writing or reading ability of the student? Is it possible that instruction in grammar is simply a "must," a shibboleth which we perpetuate, a categorical imperative, a cultural fetish?

Some colleges have had to drop any effort to teach grammar to entering freshmen, usually because the problems of staffing are overwhelming. It isn't because the freshmen do not need some sort of remedial work; few college students, even graduate students, are perfect in their handling of language. There are other kinds of problems, too. For example, as a department chairman I have a latent revolution on my hands because some of my younger staff members have simply refused, outright, to adopt any semblance of a grammar text for their freshman classes, while other staff members would be lost without one. Here is convention and revolt at full tide, and I am not the kind of chairman to coerce active and intelligent young instructors who can produce as good results as the rest. What has happened to me as a result of this revolt is that I am driven to consider the role of grammar or grammars in language instruction. One of the options, of course, is to try to see what the study of grammar systems actually accomplishes.

Incidentally, I do not want to lose sight of the fact that our panel is concerning itself with the major issues in the preparation of <u>teachers</u> of English in the secondary schools, and therefore I must remember that even if those prospective teachers were not to give instruction in grammar to their pupils it would not necessarily follow that they should be without instruction in grammar themselves. What this distinction points up, quite clearly, is that the prospective teachers must be knowledgeable in the field of <u>language</u>, including an appropriate study of grammar systems; but they might very well not concentrate on grammar as though it were a subject they were to teach their students. In similar fashion, they might make a careful study of the historical development of the language, or of dialectology, or of lexicology,

and yet never attempt to teach any of these subjects to their own students. You will understand that I am trying to get grammar into its appropriate place in the language curriculum. Grammar is not the language, obviously; it is merely one aspect of it. And whether it is that aspect of language which most readily or most assuredly brings about an adeptness in using the English language, in speaking or writing or reading, is a doubt I would raise.

Needless to say, our objective with students in English classes at any level is to enhance their powers of expression, to lead them confidently to a skillful use of the English language. The effective use of language we call rhetoric. Can we teach this ideal, rhetoric, through the wise employment of models? Or do we do it more readily through instruction in grammatical analysis? A recent publisher's blurb says that a given text "is designed to teach the student to write with clarity, vigor, and grace; and to secure his commitment to the discipline of writing, not by the prescription of rules, but through the testimony of eloquent prose." We cannot possibly quarrel with this aim. The trick lies in the latter portion of the statement, "to secure his commitment to the discipline of writing . . . through the testimony of eloquent prose." I will teach you to paint, my dear (or at least make you want to paint well), by leading you by the hand through the art gallery; I will make you a composer by taking you to the next concert by the Philharmonic; I will teach you to write, my boy, by . . . by . . . by showing you a system of grammatical relationships. Here our effort at analogy grinds deservedly to a halt; here our reductio grinds to an absurdum.

In order to approach our ideal of an able use of the English language--perhaps a phrase something like "the practiced use of English" would be meaningful here--we can and do employ varying teaching techniques. I don't know that I can with confidence name a specific number, for the techniques blend into one another and distinctions are thereby lost. It is a fine thing to contemplate a magical technique that would develop practiced writers of English, perhaps the sort of process reflected in Stephen Dedalus' experience among his Jesuit schoolmasters in Joyce's Portrait, or that training described very carefully and effectively by Coleridge in his Biographia Literaria, wherein his master at Christ's Hospital made him weigh and justify every word used in every phrase, seeking that ideal which Coleridge later characterized as 'the proper word in the proper place.' Alas, we are not able to give, in our world of mass education, such finely tooled instruction. We must therefore try to establish another technique.

When I cast up my revised title for this paper, "Why Grammar--or What?" I had in mind, vaguely, the prospect of isolating two techniques, one of them to be thrown in doubt by the sharp question, "Why Grammar?" and the other to be broached under the quizzical phrase, "Or What?" That is, if not grammar, what kind of alternative? The first, which I will call Technique Number One (spelling it with capital letters), would be to teach one or more systems of grammar--probably fewer rather than more because of the increasing complexity of the individual systems when they are brought under comparative or contrasting scrutiny. Some of us have talked about such a plan of teaching a blend of systems of grammar, possibly two or more, but have come to think less well of the idea as we have studied the implications. The proposed technique would be, to be sure, a marked improvement on the old-fashioned, schoolbook,

traditional grammar, because any of the modern grammar systems taught would have to include a study of phonology, morphology, and syntax, without which any grammar is woefully deficient. The old textbook grammars did not include these components and were thus incomplete. But there are problems, even when an enlightened sense of a system of grammar is contemplated.

For one thing, it is possible, and all too compelling, to teach a system of grammar quite out of the context of the language to which it belongs, just as you can teach a system of musical notation without knowing much about or paying much attention to music as an art. The human animal is a system maker, or at least may be called system prone, and often takes refuge in a system when the alternatives are difficult. Many teachers do practice this kind of pedagogy, especially if their classes are devoted to "grammar" rather than to literature. You can, in fact, teach a system of grammatical analysis for a language without ever having to confront the problems of the skillful and practiced use of that language--the most productive and to which that language can be put. Doubtless some of the instruction given in the modern foreign languages is of such caliber, especially where the teacher cannot hope to continue in classes with his students long enough to bring them to the point where they can "write French" or "write German," as distinguished from the elementary stages of writing *in* French or writing *in* German. However, the "glove of my aunt" type of instruction does not suit as a method for teaching English to the native born. Even foreign language instruction, in the audio-lingual techniques, has moved to better things. We should take careful note of this. I am not suggesting that English instruction should go to the audio-lingual techniques of the modern foreign languages. We can and must take care, however, that our instruction in English grammar is not stultifying, and does not follow the rut that the foreign languages were in a generation ago.

Technique Number One, even under the best auspices, suffers from another marked disadvantage. As a means of teaching the *use* of the language--and this is a problem not of analysis but of synthesis--it is certain to fail because any system of grammar, based as it must be on an analysis of a living language, is bound to be partially incomplete. For one thing, language is dynamic whereas a system of analysis is static (despite the context which the label "generative" supplies.) Any one system of analysis is simply the collective work of certain minds, moving toward a common understanding. Meanwhile new minds are forming new groups, or observing new connections, and thus are produced new systems of analysis. As long as a student is concentrating on one or more systematic analyses of the grammar of a given language, he will scarcely be able to put himself into a position to practice the synthesis which language use demands, or will at least find his time between analysis and synthesis, especially if he is considering only the grammatical aspects of language. He will fall short of a suitable rhetoric; his compositions may be grammatically acceptable, but they will also probably be sterile in effectiveness. We have all read such compositions; they could be turned out by a computer.

The second technique, the alternative to Technique Number One--I hesitate to go to the formality of calling it Technique Number Two because this would tempt us to think in finite terms--is to learn and teach as much as is possible about the given language--to see as much in it as one can possibly see. In

[illegible] approach, the basic assumption is that a language is much larger than its grammar (or grammars). Technique Number One, with its attention to phonology, morphology, and syntax, would call what the grammar (of English, for example) excludes to be: but as a study it would still be deficient because it would not have connected the grammar with the world of language. It is only from a knowledge of the English language that we can hope to produce a grammatical use of English, not a sentence grind. This second technique would involve in making a communicative distinction between grammar and language. To choose elements of phonology, morphology, and syntax which comprise grammar, it would then add a many-sided study of the historical development of the language, the appropriateness of usages and dialects, and additionally move to the sociolinguistic or humanistic and cultural features of the language.

There are so many variations and possibilities to the environment in such a technique that would be this area will engage our attentions for some time. The immediate work is, in large measure, a matter of building a curriculum. As my institution we are now hopefully constituting to start work. We have been able to get almost under a grant from the USOE, in an enterprise we called deliberately "Project Grammar" when we began a year ago. My associate, Professor James Deese, is guiding the full time to teaching and research in the area of interaction in language and linguistics for prospective secondary school teachers of English. Like any problem in composition which must anticipate a satisfying and effective outcome--whether it be in music or in painting or in chemistry--the construction of a curriculum in language and linguistics for English teachers always must have in full focus the two major decisions of "what elements" and "in what order for maximum effect." We are not satisfied with considering of our task as a mere placement of elements in a curriculum. The whole problem seems in longer view a simple sum of the parts. Furthermore, the parts have a bearing on one another which can be made to lead to understanding rather than mere recognition. Teaching what there is to understand about a language is no job for amateurs.

When I encountered my assigned topic here the long-then-clear question of "Why Grammar--or What?" I hoped to be able to lead you, by the "Is What?" route, to a reconsideration of some of the questions before us. A proceeding affirmative (the "What?") to the teaching of grammar (that which I have called Technique Number One) to a curriculum for prospective teachers which would include, in a satisfying sequence and learned order of scientific success, all those elements of the field of language and linguistics which we have by the names phonology, morphology, syntax, historical development, dialectology, usage levels, lexicology, semantics, sociolinguistics, and the rest. How will modern grammar (or grammars) be considered within the total field of language study; but it be the only one element of our interest. We now seem unable to keep that grammar will be or could be slighted. Modern grammar there can be no language. But to understand grammar alone--even if this were possible, which it is not--is not to understand language. We will have other uses and we must find a means of putting it into proportion. We should be prepared to answer as best we can the questions we must profitably entertain. The elements are common knowledge, of course, but the "how," like a question's a question, is still quite crucial and controversial. We are hopeful that outcomes may affect a profitable and effective alternative to the old-traditional approach to language.

WHAT LITERATURE--AND WHY?

John S. Gerrietts
Loyola University

When one is confronted with the topic "What Literature--and Why," it is the *why* that must be faced first. In fact, whether the *what* can or should be determined in any generally applicable way is very doubtful. We can hardly hope to determine in detail the *what* in such a way that it would be widely acceptable or beneficial; but we can seek some agreement on the *why*, that is, on the principles to be employed in determining the *what*, even though the *what* may turn out to be quite different in varying situations.

We are today concerned with the training of English teachers and are therefore ultimately concerned with their college curriculum in literature. But we must begin with a consideration of the level at which the teacher being trained will teach. The growth of the student in his literary knowledge is really a continuous process, in a sense all the way from the grammar school to beyond the Ph.D. Although we may conveniently devote our attention first of all to the high school level, most of what we will be saying will be applicable, with some variation, to the junior college as well, and will even have a strong analogy in the college.

Much of the initial part of our task has already been performed by the Commission on English in its report *Freedom and Discipline In English*. We need freedom in establishing our curricula so that we may adapt to various situations and so that we may continue to be dynamic; but we also need at least the minimal discipline that we impose upon ourselves in trying to establish aims and principles for constructing our curricula. The charge upon the speakers today has been to present challenging ideas so that ensuing group discussions will be lively. So if I say some things that are provocative or even outrageous perhaps they will serve their purpose.

English teachers at every level are simply confronted with too many responsibilities. What should be their prime responsibilities? to teach the difference between right and wrong? to teach good citizenship? to train their students for a place in a particular social environment? to teach ideas, however remote from purely literary considerations? to aid the student's development of initiative in extra-curricular activities? to produce a good school newspaper or year book so that the school will look good to the community (the taxpayers)? Are the English teachers the custodians of ethics, of character, of citizenship, of adjustment to society, of the great thoughts of all the other fields of study, of student initiative, of community relations?

By this time the answer to the questions I raise, The prime responsibility of the English teacher in teaching literature is to teach literature. This is not to say that an English teacher may not effectively help to teach many other things, but he should be made to feel that his primary responsibility as a professionally trained person is to teach English (the language, the literature, and composition). In achieving the other worthwhile aims that a school should strive for he should have no greater responsibility than his fellow teachers of other subjects. Robert Maynard Hutchins once said that the

function of education is directed entirely toward the intellect and that even the influencing of character development is outside its direct concern.

Some of the proliferation of the responsibilities of the English teacher have been of his own making--a natural historical drive toward enlarging his province--and the natural tendency of the English teacher, with his orientation toward the humane, to take on extra burdens. But if our profession is ever to succeed in its work it must resist these impositions and concern itself mainly with its own province, of which literature is a major part. It is popular to say today that the objective of the English teacher is to teach language, literature, and composition. And this is a good statement. But there may be a tendency to think of these three elements as virtually independent of one another. The very structure of this program today, as is true of a great many conferences, tends to suggest the separation of the three elements. Speaking on the literature component, I want to emphasize particularly its relationship to language study and to composition as well. Truly successful English Teaching must merge all three, not treating them as separate elements. Language is to literature what oils are to painting; literature is language before it is romantic, or classical, or experiential, or evocative, or anything else. And literature is the prime illustration of the art of <u>composing</u> in language.

Why do we want to teach literature? Presumably not primarily to teach anything extra-literary. Presumably, therefore, primarily to teach literature as an art. But does this mean that literature is on a par with the other art forms in our schools? No. For literature is unique among them in communicating with words--and therefore in communicating ideas and experiences in a manner that the other arts are usually incapable of. The result of literary study for the student is of course humanistic, but it is above all else a skill--a verbal and intellectual formation--a development of the critical faculty--truly, although the word may have for some people an unfavorable connotation, a discipline. Literature is not for the dilletante; for the serious student it is far more rigorous and demanding than, say, mathematics or astrophysics.

The report of the Commission on English stresses the pluralistic nature of English studies. We will presumably never want to work toward anything like a completely standard curriculum. We need to remain free to face the varying situations: the differing abilities of students, the varied social and geographic milieus, etc.

One premise that we may agree on is that what we are seeking is the growth of the student in his ability to understand, to interpret, to analyze, to evaluate--all of which are involved in the total act of appreciation of the literary work. And to achieve this growth the curriculum must be organized so that the student is always facing texts that are (1) not wholly beyond the reach of his ability, but (2) always sufficiently beyond the demands of his previous assignments so that they will induce this growth.

Common methods of organizing the literary components of English courses are 1) historical, 2) thematic, and 3) by genres. All of these may have value. The historical development of literature, and particularly of its techniques, should certainly not be neglected. The thematic common elements

in literature should also be exploited, although these may tend to stress too much the non-literary elements in literature. But it is the study of literature by genres that is the most germane to the truly professional interest of the English teacher. History and ideas can be learned from many sources, but literature can be learned only from literature.

Of the literary genres is there any one that should be taught more than another at any particular level? I would say in a somewhat tentative way that we need to stress fiction, long or short, essays, and other types of prose more than we do. The intelligent analysis of non-fictional prose tends to be particularly neglected. Yet it is perhaps the best vehicle at the lower levels for teaching rhetoric and structure. Poetry should be taught whenever the student's ability is up to the task of reading poetry not as something that differs from prose only in being rhythmical, but as something in which language has reached a relatively high level of complexity in its utilization of imagery, figurative language, and rhetoric. I submit that it is much less important for a student to know what an iamb or a trochee is than to understand the impact and potentiality of, for instance, a paradox. And the study of plays may be very far from his most elementary needs. In short, reacting to our own pleasure in poetry and drama, we may sometimes tend to try to teach these when we have not already provided a sufficiently firm foundation in the literary genres that are easier for a student.

In the matter of fiction a special caution might be voiced; other things being equal, we should always prefer the work in which the prose style and diction are most suitable for our purposes. To illustrate what I mean, I might say that of the two works that have been in the not too distant past very popular with high school students, Salinger's Catcher in the Rye and Golding's Lord of the Flies. I would find the latter by far the better choice, not specifically on the grounds of a distaste for Salinger's four-letter words, but rather because of the positive qualities of Golding's prose. Although fiction of course has a place in the curriculum, if we keep in mind our concern for language as a part of literature, fiction often has to be selected with the utmost care.

The curriculum in literature should obviously always be one of gradual, steady growth. This may involve the relative sophistication in the use of language and in historical milieu. But it also involves most importantly a growth in the understanding of rhetoric and structure. At every stage of the student's development in English he should have a sufficiently firm foundation for the next challenge; but the next item should always be a challenge. No one grows from continuing to read on the same level.

But are we to conclude our consideration of high school curriculum without any specific suggestions of authors or works? Probably we cannot agree on a single work at any given educational level, and perhaps not even on any single author. And this may be as it should be: we need freedom to adapt. As long as we keep in mind our prime objective, to provide a basis for the development of the student's ability to learn what makes literature literature, then our specific selections, however varied, will be good and right.

I have said that perhaps we can not agree even on a single author. If

we can, I suppose it would be Shakespeare. But I am not altogether certain that even Shakespeare belongs in every high school curriculum. A few years ago when I was one of a group who had been asked to serve as consultants on English curriculum for a large school system, a question we were asked was: "If students are not able to read Hamlet, should they be told the story?" This is as stupid as enrolling students with a third-grade English reading ability in a French program. Knowing something second-hand about Hamlet may serve some social purpose, but hardly will advance the objectives of English.

Through the years I have also received a steady flow of letters from high school teachers who ask: "What works do you think your incoming freshmen should have read?" And I have never been able to answer this question. I have no idea. It is not what they should have read, but how well they can read, in the fullest sense of the term.

There is perhaps a false implication in some of what I have been saying. It may seem that I am stressing the difficulty and the challenge to the point where all of the fun will be destroyed. Well, fun is not the main objective, but certainly the curriculum should always keep in mind the Horatian principle of delight and should nourish the fun even if this means an occasional pause or interruption in the growth of the student's knowledge of language and literature. We should also note that there is always delight--exhilaration--in having met a challenge.

Although the principles that we have been considering are applicable at various levels, it is time now to consider briefly the implications of these for the training of secondary school English teachers.

There are already thousands of excellent teachers. If we only knew why these are excellent, we would be facing no problem. But we also know that at least some of our teachers are not.

What we should do in the literary preparation of the teacher may be quite a different matter in accordance with the basic ability of the individual to be trained. A factor in the present situation has been the low salaries that have failed to attract into teacher training those of the greatest ability. A related factor is that the ranks of English teachers have included far too many who looked upon teaching English as a temporary occupation, not a professional commitment.

If we were to attract into secondary school English teaching only persons of superior ability, we would need to teach them only the critical art--no small task of course. But unfortunately many of those who are trained to teach English do not have superior ability, and it therefore becomes necessary to teach them not only the why but the what. That is to say, the superior person merely needs to be taught how to treat literature, and then will be able to transfer this ability in criticism to any text; but the person of lesser ability may in many instances have to be taught the particular piece of literature that he will later be expected to teach.

This really touches upon a much larger concept in teacher education. For example, is the teacher of mathematics well qualified if he knows mathematics

only up through the level at which he will be teaching it? or to be fully qualified does he need to know mathematics at a significantly higher level? Surely the latter. Should we not therefore hope and expect that the English teacher who perhaps has never been taught Oliver Twist or David Copperfield will be better qualified because he has been taught to cope with Bleak House. Far too many prospective teachers, as well as teachers who come back for further study, merely want to study exactly the works that they will teach. This reveals a horrifying misconception of what their roles should be.

I dislike concluding on a pessimistic note. But what is one to do with the prospective teacher who merely wants to be taught the texts he is going to have to teach? I really don't know. There is no satisfactory way of predicting what texts he is going to have to teach; so how can we know which ones to teach him?

The only solution is to adopt an optimistic pose, to assume that he is a person of native ability and that he can be taught to view his prospective teaching as a professional commitment, to treat him as a person capable of rising well above the level at which he is going to teach, and to continue striving to make him develop his ability to read, understand, interpret, analyze, evaluate, so that he will be able to adapt to any situation, any curriculum that he may encounter or that he himself may have to develop. And then, pray. Prayer is an intense and fervent wish.

WHAT COMPOSITION, AND WHY?

Margaret M. Neville
DePaul University

English faculty in many parts of the country have been questioning the value of the composition courses given at their schools, and have been seeking ways to improving existing courses or substituting new ones. For example, a panel discussion listed for the forthcoming CCCC meeting at Louisville is entitled "New Ideas in Freshman Composition: Elimination, Reduction, Extension?"

At the same time some college composition instructors still complain that their high school counterparts have not prepared the students well, not even those students who have been in the top third of their graduation classes. Instructors in upper level courses complain that they have to teach composition as well as their own subject matter. Graduate school English professors, many of whose students are high school teachers, still find plentiful use for their red pencils on seminar papers.

Against the background of all these uncertainties and dissatisfactions, the question: WHAT COMPOSITION, AND WHY? becomes very important in the preparation of the English teacher. It will not be our function in this quarter of an hour to offer any dogmatic answer to the question, but rather to raise issues involved, suggest a possible approach to an answer, and so alert the participants at this conference to problems which each must solve as befits his own situation.

The College world is being constantly deluged with new composition texts, readers, handbooks, case-books, vocabulary builders, research guides, and whatever other publishable components professor-writers and market conscious publishers can invent. It is too easy these days to adopt a text, or more probably a group of them, and keep students busy through a series of "Composition" courses without having much actual composition. If, however, the English faculty decides the student must write so many hundred words a week, it is possible to direct him through the paces of ten or twelve themes a quarter by using class time for discussion of essays in his college Reader and then assigning one of the "Topics for Discussion" given at the end of each essay for his weekly theme.

Usually neither instructor nor student has much worth while to write on the topic, but that fact doesn't matter. The paper will be given to the instructor in due time, and he will put thereon in red evidence of his proofreading. After the required number of repetitions of this process, the student will receive an IBM card, assuring him that credit for English 101 has been recorded for him. Later he may add English 102 and an "advanced composition" credit to his accumulation. But what has he been taught? This is a conscience-searching question for each of us who is concerned with college English, but especially for those concerned with the college preparation of English teachers.

Should a composition course be used mainly to expose the student to a

variety of ideas on any subject that can be included in a freshman anthology? It is true that we give the student a chance to write his reactions to what he reads, but is this chance enough to justify a course entitled "Composition"? Is the discussion of democratic process in a local election, or of holiday customs in Scandinavia - both typical subjects for inclusion in a college reader - an effective way to teach composition? I would say such discussion can be effective in composition teaching only if the instructor guides the student to realize how the article writer succeeded in fulfilling the purpose of his article, only if the instructor conscientiously uses the reader selections as a tool in his teaching.

Just what is to be taught in the process called college composition? Just what do our prospective English teachers - elementary, secondary and collegiate - need to know in order to be able to insure in their respective positions the adequate training of their future students in effective written communication? First of all, they should know what composition is; they should know not merely the mechanics of the complete sentence and the niceties of the best usage (often mistaken for grammar), but the real what.

The teacher needs to know underlying principles of oral and written communication, not merely the rules for correct procedure. The student preparing to teach has been using his language for a long time in both speech and writing. Has he ever been led to analyze what he is doing from the points of view of logic, psychology and the linguistic behavior of his own community? Such analysis should lead him to underlying principles without which his evaluation of his own composition, and later his evaluation of that of his own students will be uncertain. In his uncertainty he will fall back on evaluation by "correctness" standards, the correct paper being the one on which he can cite no violations of the composition handbook rules.

From years of teaching advanced composition to teachers, especially in summer school, I have come to the conclusion that much composition teaching in both high school and college has been done on the "correctness" pattern. In evaluation of papers these teachers have been ready and eager to point out that who instead of whom, or that lack of a comma after an introductory phrase (probably a phrase so short that there was no need for a comma). These students give evidence that it is easier to learn and to teach the so-called rules than to discover for themselves and reveal to their own students the complete nature of what we call composition. The complaint I have indicated here is analogous to the one English teachers often make against Education teachers - that Educationists deal in methods with no content to use them on. When we teach so-called rules, including eighteenth century grammar rules, over and over again from grade school through the freshman year of college, we are behaving in less admirable fashion, for we don't have even methods, but only accessories, or at best devices for clarifying our communication.

What, then, should be the general plan of a challenging composition course taught at an advanced level in college, or at a basic level in high school or in the higher grades? Let me present a brief description of one possible approach to composition. The course should begin with a recognition of our need to communicate in writing with our fellow men, and should explore the use of words as media of this communication. At the college level this

phase of the composition course should involve some study of our ways of knowing and of practical logic. Our course would proceed to the relationship between communication and grammar, with some stress on the social acceptability of certain grammatical forms. At the college level there should be deeper analysis of the relationship between grammar and communication, probably using some of the newer grammatical explanations of the English language, and some explanation from general linguistics.

Subsequent sections of the course would deal with such matters as grammar and rhetorical effectiveness of the sentence; paragraph development for clarity and effectiveness; planning the long composition; the relationship between plan and objective; the relationship between objective and the traditional four forms - Exposition, Narration, Description, and Argumentation. All through the course students should write, preferably on subjects for which they have some reason to write outside of the necessity of producing copy for a class assignment. At the college level each section of the course should involve logical psychological analysis of what is being done.

A composition course developed on this general plan could be one way to lead the student to an understanding of what composition is. It would be not merely a writing practice course, but a systematic study of the nature of written communication which could be equally useful to those who wish to use writing in some career, and to those who will teach English composition.

I am not saying that the course I have briefly described is the only way to approach composition teaching. I am asking, however, whether we do not have to face the necessity of making all the components of written communication the major subject matter of our course at any educational level? Can we afford, therefore, not to supply to the prospective English teacher the type of college composition courses that will give such a systematic study of written communication as he needs to prepare himself for the work we expect him to do in his own classroom? If he is not so prepared, he will use the time assigned for composition to discuss essays and stories, and his students will write themes, and he will proof-read the themes; and we will complain in college that the high school has not done its work in composition teaching, and our upper level instructors will complain, and our graduate school English professors will complain. And we all will have reason to complain.

WHY MAKE THEM TALK ALIKE?

A. L. Davis
Illinois Institute of Technology

(Ever since I suggested the title for this short paper, I have felt it to be somewhat restricting. I should like to change it to "The Problem of Making Them Talk Middle Class.")

In our society with its emphasis on social mobility and progress, countless man-years and vast sums are invested in making as many people as possible middle class. As language is one of the most reliable of class indicators, it follows that the use of a middle class dialect is highly desirable.

English teachers, then, have a serious responsibility. Fortunately, recent linguistic research is making it possible for teachers to understand the nature of this complex task that society has implicitly placed on their shoulders.

The nature of dialect is sometimes misunderstood and that of class dialect often misunderstood. Everyone speaks a dialect, that is, there are features in his speech which serve to identify him with a regional and social group. Regional dialects in this country have been intensively studied, but work with social dialects is in its infancy. I believe that most of this audience is familiar with the Linguistic Atlas; however, a brief summary may be useful. The Linguistic Atlas of New England (1939-1943) is a compilation of hundreds of interviews with representative speakers of all social classes in the New England States. These interviews follow a questionnaire designed to provide information about phonology, grammar, and folk vocabulary, all recorded in detailed phonetic transcription. Field work has continued for the Middle and South Atlantic States, and editing has been started under the direction of Raven I. McDavid Jr. If funds can be found to continue this work, publication may be expected in five years. The importance of the Atlas records for the Atlantic states is that they describe the dialects of the areas of primary settlement. Additional field work has been carried on in most states but the entire project for all of the United States and Canada is far from complete.

Historically, the regional dialects fit the settlement history with some spreading of speech features from the larger cities into the surrounding countryside. The evidence thus far indicates that within the major dialect regions speech is becoming more uniform, with relic areas dying out.

Within a speech community itself, the speech habits of those of high social status may in time become somewhat different from those of lower status, as has happened in the older metropolitan areas. Regional dialects may become associated with particular ethnic groups, such as the Pennsylvania German around Lancaster, or social dialects may be associated with speech of immigrants as with Yiddish English in most large cities. Since World War II, urban schools have found their problems tremendously complicated by the in-migration of large numbers of Negroes and rural Whites (Appalachians, for example) speaking dialects of the lower classes of quite different geographical regions.

In the Middle West the pronunciation problem for the schools was mostly that of the eradication of foreignisms ("dis, dat, dem, dose") and with unusual words. The farmer and the professional man sounded very much alike. But the in-migrants bring a set of speech habits so divergent as to be, at times, nearly unintelligible.

In studying lower class dialects two different components must be sorted out. One consists of the differences which are social indicators, the other is the adequacy in communication in any context. Many studies have shown that sentence syntax is less tightly structured in lower class speech and may for this reason be less adequate to form complex ideas. Bereiter and Englemann say "The disadvantaged child masters a language for maintaining social relationships and for meeting his social and material needs, but he does not learn how to use language for obtaining and transmitting information, for monitoring his own behavior and for carrying on verbal reasoning."[1] We need more studies to see to what extent this may remain true for the speech of lower class adults.

Capell reports a serious language inadequacy in the Roper River area of Australia, where the local mission "faced with a mixture of anything up to eleven languages, has used only English. The present generation has grown up with little or no knowledge of any of the old languages, but has not mastered English either, because the English of the home is imperfect and teachers cannot cope with the home influence."[2] To a lesser extent many of the difficulties lower-class Negro children have with English may be of similar origin. William Stewart argues that there are structural differences, passed on from child to child, having as their origin a Creole English spoken by slaves.[3] Whether or not this is the case with American Negro English at the lower social levels, some structural features in verb conjugation show that aspect rather than tense may be the basic system. Of most importance is that dialects must be analyzed in their own terms, rather than as merely different from a hypothetical standard norm.

As additional evidence is forthcoming we may decide that special techniques such as those used in the teaching of English to foreigners will be necessary, and they are in fact being experimented with. Ideally desirable: for lower class children who are speakers of completely native sub-standard dialects, for those of foreign language backgrounds, for lower class in-migrant children from different dialect regions, and for the general development of language adequacy. It is obvious that a complete tailoring of materials and techniques would be impractical, but we can get much closer to this ideal than we are at present.

---

[1]Carl Bereiter and Sigfried Englemann, Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Pre-School. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, p. 42.

[2]A. Capell, Studies in Socio-Linguistics. Mouton and Co.: The Hague, 1966, pp. 58-59.

[3]William A. Stewart, "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching," in Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965, pp. 16-17.

Whatever methods are developed to handle the speech problems of lower class pupils, it is certain that the profession will continue in its attempts to wipe out this invisible barrier to social and economic opportunity. But understanding of what needs to be done is becoming much clearer. Although it is highly unlikely that there will ever be a time when everybody will speak like everybody else, it does seem possible that the situation within which can approach that of the parts of the Middle West, where the distinguishing marks of upper and middle class speech are in common structure and richness of vocabulary, with systematic differences of little importance.

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to develop skills and coaching will become the literature learning we all hope for. But for this to happen, the student must recognize problems, search for alternative solutions, and make choice solutions. This is the framework I could impose on a fifth-year program. Problems posed, alternative solutions formulated, and solutions evaluated. This is the process that seems to me to be basic to the continuing development of the teacher.

Ideally, it would be a lifetime program. The student would come to the program with an awareness of a problem. His advisor, the English-education specialist would help him decide where to seek solutions--perhaps the methods course, perhaps an English course, perhaps an education course, or perhaps the library. Here, then, the problem that the student chose to solve grows as a basis for selecting among the many courses of study available to him. Then the student should be free the alternatives he chose to use possible solutions, to formulation those solutions. In this formulation of solutions he is involved in applying and putting together the various studies he has undertaken. This culminates activities is hard, he writes them out in the classroom. But he is working. But the working is classroom participation is an integrated part of the problem solving. It is not an isolated task of "problem-solving." The problem solving is an ideal basis for evaluating a program of English-education because it solves the major problem--individualizing the program, obtaining the most appropriate courses of study, and integrating the various aspects of the program.

The ideal program, then, can be described as an English-education practicum in which the student first commits to the questions that he wants answered. As part of a program, each student considers what goes through his own problems in his own way, and the program should give him the opportunity to assess the development of his own skills in the light of his purposes. And as a program, each student considers what goes through his own problems in his own way, and the program should give him the opportunity to assess the development of his own skills in the light of his purposes.

First, inexperienced students will not identify problems. Instead, they must be confronted with them. Some of the most fundamental skills of teaching often seem most trivial. Let me give you an example. In a forty-minute class, the teacher begins by distributing papers. As he does so the kids are talking, four or five come up to ask questions about their grades, two hand him absence passes to sign, one wants to know what he missed yesterday. The teacher remains calm and patient, gets everyone seated, quiets the class and begins. Five minutes have gone. After thirty minutes of instruction, five minutes from the end of the period, he lets the students begin the next day's reading. He also does go grade papers but the kids talk rather than read. He grows exasperated. The bell rings. What has happened? Ten minutes of the period have been lost. One-quarter of the instructional time has been wasted! Such a situation is unbilled. He does not know how to begin a class; he does not know how to end one. He does not know how to structure a discussion so that students will work independently. He is lacking some very basic skills. But if we suggested this kind of thing to a fifth-year student who had never been in the classroom, he would rather question the 'hidden issues' of how to start classes, how to end classes. There are assignments to the contrary because he thinks 'anyone can do that.' The program must confront the student with the situation so that he will see the problems. Only after that will the student willingly develop those skills. A first major step in any English education program must, then, be problem confrontation. The English education specialist must establish the situation that makes his students aware of the problems of teaching so that they can seek solutions to those problems.

In doing so we confront the dilemma of curriculum by addition. There are so many problems to consider that we do not have time to learn

preparation of English teachers and, unfortunately, an often ignore it at our evaluation" exposure. There are three general levels of problems in the teaching of English, and they must be ordered from immediate to ultimate in terms of their priority in a fifth-year program.

The most fundamental skills of teaching are the general pedagogical skills of classroom management--beginning the class, collecting papers, assigning activities, etc. If a teacher does not do these things well, discipline breaks down, students get out of control, and the teacher cannot possibly consider the more complex and more important problems of English instruction. These "how to teach" problems are the ones you are of teaching. Without them the fundamentals of the classroom will be so great that the teacher will become frustrated and will not achieve even the more "important" problems will be ignored. They may seem trivial and they may seem small little time, but they are an absolute necessity. These "how to teach" problems come first.

Beyond these "how to teach" skills are those of "how to teach well." They consider, in fact many practicing teachers, have no idea that there is great skill involved in formulating questions. They do not recognize that it is a skill. The skills of asking good questions, ordering learning activities for specific objectives, the problems of evaluating success are all second level problems, "how to teach well" problems. At this level the skills of testing and evaluating the success of the teaching is particularly important. Many teachers think they solve composition problems with grammar instruction. They do not. But only empirical evaluation will prove it. If the teacher is concerned on finding problems, developing corrective activities, and testing them empirically, then the success of the second level of problems.

The third level is developing ways to teach. This is to make other than the teacher's theme a good job of developing ways to improve or maintain the high standards of the teacher's own subject matter. This level of teaching is the most important of the three but it is the most difficult to achieve. It is the level of teaching that is the most difficult to achieve. It is the level of teaching that is the most difficult to achieve. It is the level of teaching that

I have, then, enumerated three levels of skills in the teaching of English and suggested that they must be approached in progressfrom immediate to ultimate--from "how to teach" to "how to teach well" to curriculum building. I have suggested that they must all be approached as problem solving sessions to develop the student's skill with this fundamental process of English instruction. You may, of course, choose to agree or disagree with these rather distinctive pronouncements, but whether you agree or disagree, every English education specialist must follow some course of reasoning to arrive at decisions about principles so that his program will have stronger logical structure than the suggested skills that usually result in a curriculum developed by addition. With such decisions about principles in mind, the specialist has a basis for diagnosing what students can and cannot do and consequently what problems he should confront them with. He has a solution to the practical problem of helping students focus on the most important problems they will face as English teachers.

The third practical problem of English education programs that I would like to discuss briefly is that of making the best advantage of the currently available academic structures. The major problem here is that the academic courses available to our students are not directly focused on the problems of teaching. For example, take the English education student who has just completed his courses in educational psychology and go to the child psychology, male, Italian descent, mother with children, suicide rate of children lowest economic from grade two on, most underachieving specialist each year grades one through nine, presents reading level with grade, writing level kindergarten, speech minimum, often incomprehensible, seldom to class. What do you do? I will predict that the answer will consist of a list of authorities--the reading specialist, the school psychologist, a social agency, the new doctor. But if you ask these new specialists, the student will exhibit the same old problem. They say, "What will I do in the classroom about these kids?" Answer: "Well, you'll have to do assignments on the level." Oh, no! Of course not. "What will you judge him?" Bringing back evaluation. We start the whole cycle of problems again. The point of this brief description is that just completing a set of the traditional courses in education psychology, for example, has done very little to help

to handle various kinds of situations. From this diagnosis, the student and the specialist design a program of study for the next academic term that they feel is most likely to help the student solve the problems he faces. Again children are hired to provide experimental situations so that the student can test his growing abilities. As problems are solved and skills developed, new problems are confronted. The student teacher not only grows, but he learns through the process of problem confrontation how to grow. At the end of the year he gets a degree which means very little, because the next year he will continue doing exactly the same kind of thing he has been doing in the fifth-year program, because that program has been individualized, has logically selected content, and has integrated that content through the problem solving approach. That is why I recommend this structure for a fifth-year program.

THE STATE OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH

J. N. Hook
University of Illinois

I.

Previous articles have been written to describe typical programs of a decade or more ago and then to indicate the kinds of changes that have taken place or are taking place in current-looking programs of today.

A majority of programs of the fifties consisted of a certain number of hours of general education, a certain number of hours of English (usually twenty or twenty-five or more semester hours in addition to freshman composition), a certain number of hours of education, and various institutional or state requirements such as work in physical education or a course in the history of the state.

Perhaps the biggest weakness of such programs lay in the lack of breadth in the English courses. English is a three-pronged subject. An English teacher needs to know literature, composition, and the English language. In colleges in the fifties he usually obtained a considerable amount of experience in literature, some effort, in fact, was made to integrate English work across from one area to another, but composition was the Cinderella subject. Its offerings had an aroma of inadequacy and an abhorrent complexion. In a study published by the NCTE in 1963, it was suggested that for secondary English teacher preparation only a fraction of the colleges required a course in the history of the English language, only 17% had such required a course in modern English grammar, and only 8% had such required a course in advanced composition. So for the literature emphasis, this kind of course requirement often only made more of the program appear to be concentrated in the literature courses or in the literature portion of the English courses, and for composition it was a course to be avoided if possible.[1]

An English teacher should know English, just as a science teacher should know science and a mathematician should know mathematics. If a college program was prepared to teach only one or two points of this discipline, any graduate who subsequently had difficulty in getting and keeping a job. For the majority of the courses in English composition have traditionally been required to meet graduation requirements, but (though there have been many brilliant exceptions) the teaching of composition and the teaching of the literature and structure of the English language have been poor, because many colleges had not established it as a strong area and have to fight against it. In the composition, it is to be hoped that English and other departments and composition specialists in the schools. But it is to be hoped that graduates should know the English language, since they have

---

[1] The National Interest and the Teaching of English, Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961, pp. 43 ff.

taught by teachers who themselves know little about how o write or about the intricacies and the glories of the English language.

We must blame college English departments for such deficiences. Most college English professors are professors of literature. They usually know their subject well and teach it at least fairly well sometimes brilliantly. And college students--English majors--enjoy literature. They voluntarily read widely and deeply. But a department that prepares teachers is shirking its responsibilities if its concentration almost entirely upon literature, important though literature is. That is needed is a degree of balance, with at least some work in the theory and practice of advanced composition and with some up-to-date instruction in the English language.

The course work in education was by no means totally satisfactory either (and even yet has not been substantially changed). Although specifically required courses varied from state to state or college to college, they most frequently consisted of history and philosophy of education, educational psychology, general methods of teaching, and practice teaching. Opinions that graduates held of these courses were generally less enthusiastic. In 1961, in California, 1,301 high school teachers answering the question "How important do you believe the education courses you took to obtain your credential were in making you an effective teacher?" 6% per cent said "most important"; 38.7 per cent said "of some importance"; 45.5 percent said "of little importance"; and 9.3 per cent said "of no importance."[7] A larger study, conducted nationally by the U. S. Office of Education in 1956-57, resulted in somewhat similar findings; the group involved here consisted of 7,250 beginning teachers. This study showed, though, that practice teaching was much more highly regarded than were education courses in general: 53 per cent found it "very helpful" in contrast to the 23 per cent who found education courses very helpful.[8]

James B. Conant in The Education of American Teachers (1963) took practically exactly the same position as the following teachers of high school education courses. Here are two representative comments, from English teachers:

> I think education courses are a waste of time (even in what I had four years ago) as a preparation for teaching. (They) provide good material and theoretical knowledge, but almost nothing which can be beneficial in the classroom.... Too much psychology is a class in a book that you do in a semester course.
>
> In general, I have found that the education courses I had to take (with the exception of the basic of student teaching) have been oppressive useless and totally irrelevant to the practice of teaching, which ordinarily cannot be learned from a textbook or a lecture.[9]

---

[7] Thomas Gilhooly, "A Survey of Teacher Opinion on Certification," The Phi Delta Kappan, December 1961, p. 120.

[8] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers, McGraw-Hill, 1964, p. 144.

[9] Ibid., p. 145 (Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1963), pp. 140-141.

Since the 1950's, a number of innovations and improvements in English teacher preparation programs have been instituted and even more have been recommended. Curricular reform on the college level probably occurs even more slowly and deliberately than it does on the secondary or elementary level; therefore I cannot point to any dramatically sweeping shifts in emphasis made by all or most of the nation's colleges. But trends are clearly evident, and those trends I wish now to describe.

The most thoroughgoing treatment of English teacher preparation, for all academic levels, is the fifth volume of the NCTE's curriculum series, The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges, edited in 1963 by Alfred Grommon of Stanford and contributed to by a large number of professional leaders. This volume explained what English teachers need to know and why, and described a number of existing programs that were strong in one or more of the most important aspects. Though a book like this never becomes a best-seller, this one reached many of the readers who could influence curriculum planning in their own colleges and sometimes in their own states or regions. In other words, the book contributed to a change in climate.

So did two other NCTE publications, prepared by what was called the Committee on National Interests. One of these, The National Interest and the Teaching of English, pointed out in detail the grave deficiencies in the preparation of teachers, such as those I have already mentioned. (The entire book, incidentally, was reprinted in the Congressional Record.) The second book, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English, was in fact a state-by-state study of what teachers believe to be their areas of greatest weakness. These two volumes were partially instrumental in attracting federal attention to the need for improving English teacher preparation, including post-baccalaureate work. The existence of summer NDEA institutes for English teachers, as well as the existence of certain fellowship programs and curriculum studies, is in part attributable to these two influential books.

I shall describe two additional studies and then turn to the characteristics of emerging programs.

In 1961, with financial support from the U. S. Office of Education, three organizations began a cooperative venture called the English Teacher Preparation Study. The organizations were the NCTE, the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). The involvement of MLA in this venture is noteworthy, representing as it does an almost complete reversal of an MLA position in about twelve or fifteen years. At one time MLA was the scholar's scholar, the organization noticed for the encouragement and publication of scholarly work in literature, and sometimes it appeared that the more esoteric and 'pure' the research the happier was MLA. But gradually MLA leaders in the 1950's and 1960's concluded that they should be more responsible for teacher education. So the late 50's MLA cooperated with NCTE in several projects, including the Ford Foundation sponsored conferences on basic issues in the teaching of

English. This cooperation has continued, and since some college teachers of English are reached and influenced by NLA who have no connection with NCTE, the NLA involvement was very helpful in changing academic climate and in increasing academic interest in teacher preparation. As for NASDTEC, this small group consists of the persons in each state who work with the state department of public instruction on matters of teacher preparation and certification; they usually cooperate closely with the colleges in setting minimum standards.

This year the NLA-NASDTEC group published the results of two years of conferring, discussing and writing, to which hundreds of teachers, administrators, and professors of English and education contributed. Conferences basic to the document were held in all sections of the country. The resulting statement offers six guidelines for preparation. They concern personal qualities and breadth of educational background; the need for the English teacher on any level to have a balanced study of language, literature, and composition, plus specialized methods and a course in the teaching of reading; an understanding and appreciation of a wide body of literature; skill in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and an understanding of the nature of language and of rhetoric; an understanding of the relationship of child and adolescent development to the teaching of English; and methods of teaching English, along with supervised teaching.

Another study, of which I am director, is the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center for the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English (ISCSTE). Twenty Illinois colleges and universities, funded by the U. S. Office of Education and by local money, are cooperating in this study. One of the first steps taken by ISCSTE was to agree upon a statement concerning the qualifications that every secondary English teacher should have. These are divided into knowledge of language, knowledge and skill in written composition, knowledge and skill in literature, knowledge and skill in oral communication, and knowledge and skill in the teaching of English. There are also subdivisions into "minimal", "good", and "superior" levels. Each college or university has committed itself to make, over a five-year period, those changes that seem most needed in its English teacher preparation program to enable it to do more effective work; each institution is considered also to conduct one or more special studies that may have national significance. These special studies include some on courses in the English language, reading, oral communication, in-service programs, fifth-year programs, basics of student composition, literature, composition, student teaching and supervision, special needs of junior high schools, and others.

Another major step in each of the work of some other groups: a long-awaited NCTE Commission on Teacher Preparation and Certification; a young NCTE-affiliated organization, the Conference on English Education; and the successful organization of Colleges of Teacher Education, which succeeds the committee for coordinating the accreditation standards followed by NCATE (the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). It is my judgment that multi-person groups are being committed to the preparation of these important standards, and that NCTE should be no longer a completely adhocratic-oriented body.

Now, what differences in preparation are beginning to appear as a result of these multiple efforts?

The most notable changes are occurring in the English courses. A modern program, without slighting or denigrating literature, includes at least a couple of courses in the English language. These most typically are modern English grammar and the history of the English language. Structural and transformational grammar are sometimes both taught, in relation to the traditional grammar that is still widely studied in the schools; even if a teacher is not employed by a school system that teaches one of the newer grammars, he will at least be well enough informed that he can correct some of the basic misconceptions of the traditionalists. Some teacher-preparation programs also have offerings in usage, dialectology, and lexicology (which includes semantics but also other parts of the study of words).

One or more courses in advanced composition are also being added as requirements in many institutions. The addition is most likely to be advanced exposition, but may be narrative writing or other forms of "creative" work, or may be rather intensive study of rhetorical theory and practice. A great amount of research in rhetoric is going on today, some of which has profound implications for the teaching of English. A teacher cannot be considered well qualified if he is unaware of the most important of these developments.

In literature, practical criticism is one of the most important additions. In earlier years a teacher might accumulate a large number of credits in literature courses without ever taking a course that would provide principles of criticism for practical application within the classroom. Some colleges are for the first time making available courses in world literature or comparative literature, contemporary literature, and literature for adolescents. Most colleges are taking a fresh look at their literature requirements to see whether an appropriate balance is maintained, for instance, between British and American or old and relatively new. Oral interpretation of literature, taught usually by the speech department, is becoming recognized as a uniquely valuable course for English teachers; one mark of many superior teachers is their ability to read literature aloud with great effectiveness.

Courses in the teaching of reading, offered sometimes by departments of English but more often by education, are also being increasingly required.

In other education courses, fewer changes are observable. In many colleges and universities, especially rather small ones, one of the weakest offerings is the general methods course. Taught side by side may be prospective teachers of English, science, social studies, art, music, physical education, industrial arts, or what have you. Faced with such a conglomerate population, the instructor can do little but generalize and theorize; he cannot get down to the meat of teaching English or anything else. The general methods course, perhaps more than almost anything else, has given education courses a bad name. Some colleges today, however, despite staffing problems, are trying to offer special sections or to make some other arrangements so that earlier specific instruction in methods of teaching English (or other specialized subjects) may be available.

Work in educational psychology is potentially very valuable for a teacher, but there appears to be no clear consensus as to the most suitable content for this course. As a result, many instructors and colleges follow their own inclinations, and one course or one section may be very dissimilar to another, sometimes for example devoting attention almost exclusively to tests and measurements or child development or the human nervous system, or experiments with rats and pigeons. My own opinion, for what it is worth, is that such a course is most valuable when it concerns itself with what we know about the learning process. In an institution large enough to afford multiple sections of educational psychology, a special section or sections for prospective English teachers would be worth while, with considerable attention given to applying knowledge about how children learn language and how changes in language behavior are effected.

4.

Although improvements are gradually being made in English teacher preparation, progress is slow and problems remain.

One of the problems, obviously, is how to compress so many preprofessional courses into four years. If we keep adding courses, such as those in composition and language, either other courses have to be deleted, or courses have to be combined, or more time must be allowed. All three of these solutions are being tried to some extent. The MLA-DARTMOUTH-NCTE study does not explicitly recommend a fifth year as a prerequisite for a teaching certificate, but it does indicate strongly the need for a fifth year of work either before teaching or within a short time afterward. It also describes, as our ENGLISH study is doing, some of the areas of major concern for the fifth year. Traditional MA programs are as a rule not sufficiently functional.

Another problem is that of the person who as a student takes only a minor in English and then finds himself teaching from one to five or six classes in the subject. In 1961 NCTE reported that almost exactly half of the nation's high school English teachers had no major in English. We have no up-to-date statistics for comparison, but there is no apparent evidence that the situation has noticeably improved. As a result, many English classes are taught by a person who, although often able and well-motivated, simply does not know English well enough to teach it satisfactorily. There are not enough fully qualified people to meet the need.

The answer, or an answer, to this problem lies in more and better in-service education. Large numbers of school systems have organized their own in-service programs, often with the help of nearby colleges and universities. State departments of public instruction, using USOE funds to pay part of the salaries of English specialists, are in many places providing noteworthy assistance. The NDEA institute programs and fellowship programs have also been helpful.

Still another problem in many schools has been the lack of adequate leadership in English teaching within school systems. A good supervisor or a strong department chairman can do a great deal to improve both curriculum and instruction. But such persons in the past have usually just "growed"; they

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]